ان الدين عند الله الاسلام

Regd. L-No. 2942

# The Review of Religions

*Editor*—Ali Mohammad, B.A., B.T.

V, No. 5

May, 1946

QADIAN
Punjab : India

## CONTENTS

◆ **Editorial Notes**

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

◆ **The Cabinet Mission and the Duty of Indian Leaders**
Mirza Mahmud Ahmad Head of the Ahmadiyya Community

◆ **Jesus in India**
—M. K.

☆

*Annual rates*:
India Rs. 4
Foreign 10 shillings
Students Rs. 3

*The Review of Religions* is an organ of the Ahmadiyya Movement which represents the pure and true Islam. It is open to all for discussing problems connected with the religious and spiritual growth of man, but it does not accept responsibility for views expressed by contributors.

# THE QUEST FOR EMPIRE

By Dr. MAHMOOD HUSAIN KHAN, Ph.D.

An illuminating and critical study of the present Colonial Problems with special reference to the expansion policies of Germany, Italy and Japan.

**Price Rs. 3**

# HISTORY

OF

## Early Muslim Political Thought & Administration

By Prof. H. K. SHERWANI

The author has done a great service in giving us an insight not only in the working of the political mind of some of the most eminent Muslims of old but also in giving us a running commentary on the working of political institutions under which they lived in order to find out whether there was any connecting link between the political ideas and their actual application.

**Price Rs. 8**

**MAKTABA JAMIA**

DELHI KAROL - JAMAY MASJID, DELHI
PRINCESS BUILDING, BOMBAY - AMINABAD, LUCKNOW
PUBLISHERS UNITED - LAHORE
SARHAD BOOK AGENCY, PESHAWAR

---

**A NEW SENSATIONAL BOOK**

# THE MENACE OF HINDU IMPERIALISM

**By Swami Dharma Theerathji Maharaj, B.A., LL.B.**

*Tragic history of the betrayal of India by her own Leaders and the Forces that keep her in chains*

**SOME OPINIONS**

**Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru:** I have read the book with much interest and admiration, and am prepared to admit that it is a very remarkable book written courageously and independently.

**Sir Abdul Qadir, Lahore:** I have read the book with great interest Swamiji has done a great service to the country by writing so frankly and so vigorously about some of the weak points of the Hindu social system.

**'The Theosophist,' Madras:** This is a useful and well written book inspired by sincere philanthropy and zeal for reform, and based on scholarly researches into Indian history and modern movements.

**'The Review of Religions,' Qadian:** This is a notable work by a scholar and a philosopher who is not afraid to train the searchlight of honest criticism upon his own people and country . . . We are in ull agreement with the views, so forcefully and pungently expressed in he book.

**350 pages of absorbing interest and instruction. Cloth Bound Price Rs. 4-8**

*Postage Extra*

APPLY TO:

## HINDU MISSIONARY SOCIETY

**P. O. BOX No. 225**

**KRISHAN NAGAR - LAHORE**


Printed at the Rippon Printing Press, Bull Road, Lahore, by M[illegible]

# The Review of Religions

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

| Vol. XLV | May, 1946 | No. 5 |
|---|---|---|

## EDITORIAL NOTES

### The March of Time

Though the Cabinet Delegation naturally would be the last to say so, the fact remains that the situation in India is fraught with grave and dangerous possibilities. The drift of Indian thought as between the various communities continues to insist more upon the wide gulfs which separate one from the other, and seems painfully less concerned with the far more important task of finding some common ground on which to build the future of this unfortunate country.

The persistent cry of the Muslim League is Pakistan, and there is not the least shadow of doubt that almost more than 90% of the Indian Muslims stand solidly behind this demand. But the demand in itself is not so disquieting as the Congress reaction to it. The Congress would have done well if it had tried to study, with sympathy, the causes which have led the Muslims to demand the separation of areas with Muslim majorities from the rest of India, and after proper appraisal it should have addressed itself to the removal of those grievances in regard to the past and fears in regard to the future which have given rise to the separatist tendency.

But the Congress unfortunately has not done this. Instead it has launched a vehement campaign

from the press and platform which only continues to repeat with a sickening, almost provocative, frequency that Hindu India would never agree to let the country be divided into two, and that should the British be so foolish as to entertain the Muslim demand India would be plunged into bloodshed and chaos—presumably brought about by the Hindu portion of the population, though this same population is claimed to be behind the Congress and is therefore non-violent !

At this critical juncture the Message (printed elsewhere in this issue) of Amirul Momineen Hazrat Khalifatul Masih, Head of the Ahmadiyya Movement, to the Cabinet Delegation and the Indian Leaders is a document of transcending importance for it draws the attention of both to those aspects of the situation without keeping which constantly in mind no peaceful solution of the problem is possible.

The first point made in this Message is that settlement of the Indian question should be based on the firm ground of moral principles—should be based on justice, not on political expediency ; for, as Hazrat Amirul Momineen has aptly observed, any agitation raised against a settlement based on fundamental justice is bound to be short lived, whereas the poison of an unjust settlement would continue to vitiate the future until it was righted.

Secondly, it raises point-blank a question from the Muslim side which demands an equally point-blank answer, and a satisfactory answer if the Hindus and the Muslims are to have anything in common with the India of the future—the question of religious freedom.

The Congress it is said is already committed to religious freedom in the country. But as Hazrat Amirul Momineen has shown plainly, this freedom is, to say the least, susceptible to many convenient loopholes. As the words stand in the Congress Resolution in question, the Congress intention does not seem to go beyond the freedom of any one to

practise any religion he may happen to owe allegiance to. In case any one wanted to change his religion, Hinduism for Christianity, or Islam, for instance, that would be a different matter. On this aspect of the question the Congress, it would appear, has not so far had time to make up its mind; or, if its mind is made up, it prefers to keep the question in abeyance till such time when a clear declaration of its policy should find the Muslims and the Christians in a situation where they can not do anything at all in the matter except take the decree laying down.

The root of the trouble in India in many respects is that Hinduism with its untouchability, its ban against widow remarriage and the low economic and social status it gives to women in general, is a system of social values rotten to the core.

Ever since the day it came in contact with Islam, it has been crumbling to the ground, losing constantly to this vigorous Faith at a rate considerably quicker since the British came to India than before it. If this tendency continues unchecked, a century or so from now there would hardly be any Hindu left in India. Hindu leaders have not been able to think of any safeguard against this flood of a superior culture and a superior Faith trouncing Hinduism except legislation against change of religion. This is not a fanciful suspicion; such legislation is already in force in the Indian States under Hindu rulers, where, as Hazrat Amirul Momineen has revealed, conversion exposes a man to being deprived of his share in the common property of the family, and pronounces him unfit for the guardianship of his own children.

Muslim India, however, will not let this question remain in abeyance. It must be decided now and decided to the satisfaction of the Muslims, and the Christians, for both are in the same boat in this respect. Any restriction on the change of religion smacks of the worst feature of mediævalism and should in no case be tolerated in these enlightened days.

Hazrat Amirul Momineen's Message thus has done a great service to the country in this critical phase of the talks going on between members of the Cabinet Delegation and Indian leaders, for it focuses attention upon Muslim grievances and their very real fears in regard to the future. But its supreme value lies in the counsel it gives to the Indian leaders, Hindus as well as Muslims, not to sell their beloved country to the devil rather than yield an inch of ground where their sweet pet theories are concerned.

**In the World Abroad**

Russian moves on the world chessboard carry the marks of a master-mind behind them. The uncanny thing about them is that their aim is never clear, so that they cause the severest headaches to those on whom devolves the task of defeating their purpose.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

If it is more profitable to look facts in the face rather than try to run away from them, it is perhaps as well that we should realise that the honours of the first round within the tangled ropes of the Persian arena have gone to Moscow—not to London or New York, or to the UNO either. The UNO attitude has of course remained firm, but Stalin's has been firmer, more shrewd, more practical, more worldly-wise, and more successful. Russia has gained so much in Persia without going to war that these gains she would very likely have considered quite adequate even at the expense of a more or less open clash of arms for a while. Persian sovereignty over the northern provinces has in actual fact become a thing of the past, no matter what Teheran itself and Moscow might say about it. For those who have eyes to see, Azerbaijan is a Russian Protectorate—an ideal lair where the Bear can lie stretched at ease, and watch. Russia has also obtained oil in clear violation of the Persian Law that no oil agreement could be concluded with any foreign interest while there were foreign troops on the country's soil. Moscow now has a definite tangible stake in this unfortunate country, and therefore a stick with which Stalin

would try to beat every one whenever the occasion so demands. And what has happened in Azerbaijan might next happen in any other part of the country.

The League of Nations failed because it lacked moral courage ; it could not stand up for what it thought was right. The UNO too, it would appear, is much in the same unhappy predicament. Some cynic is said to have remarked once, " Life preys upon Life ; tell me where is the Law ". Similarly a political cynic may well be tempted to ask, " When a powerful country can with such impunity prey upon a weaker nation, then Where Is UNO ?

# THE CABINET MISSION AND THE DUTY OF INDIAN LEADERS

The Cabinet Mission arrived in India about a fortnight ago to decide the political and constitutional future of the country. Several members of my community have inquired from me why the community has not been afforded an opportunity to express its views on the questions with which the Mission is concerned. My reply to them has been : First, that our community is a religious community (though it might be observed that the Indian Christian community has been invited to express its views before the Mission). Secondly, that so far as the political future of the country is concerned we are for the present in the some position as the other Muslims.

Thirdly, that we are a small minority and the Mission is concerned to ascertain the views of those parties and interests which can help to make or mar the political future of India and from the purely political point of view we are not regarded as being very important. Therefore, in spite of the fact that so far as contribution to the war effort is concerned our community, in proportion to its members, made much greater sacrifices than any other community in India, the Mission does not attach any great importance to our community.

Fourthly, there is the consideration that irrespective of the fact whether any member of the community is or is not able to place its views directly before the Mission it is always open to us to put forward our views in writing.

In pursuance of the last consideration, therefore, I proceed to invite the attention of the Mission and the leaders of political opinion in the country to certain important matters in this my first statement.

## Moral Principles

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

To the members of the Mission I desire to say in the first instance that confusion and disorder in international affairs are on the increase by reason of the fact that Governments do not consider themselves bound by moral principles in the political field whereas political policies are adopted with the object of giving satisfaction to individuals and individuals are accustomed to judge every matter from the moral standpoint. The consequence is that when people find that a decision has been arrived at which is not in accord with well-recognised moral principles it fails to give satisfaction and this feeling of dissatisfaction eventually incites them to agitation and disorder.

It is true that agitation also results from the frustration of communal and national hopes and desires but such agitation is short-lived and may be remedied without much difficulty. On the other hand, a decision which has been arrived at in defiance of moral principles might become the cause of unrest and disorder which may extend over decades or even centuries. My advice to the Mission, therefore, is that they should endeavour to find a solution of the problems of India not merely on the basis of political policies but on the basis of moral principles so that if their decision should occasion unrest or agitation in the country they should not flourish for any length of time.

Secondly, it is again true that political agreements may take on different aspects in changing circumstances. For instance, an alliance may be entered into between two Governments but if later on, one of these Governments is repudiated by its own people it may not be able to insist that the other party to the alliance should continue to be bound by the agreement into which it had entered. For all agreements are based on the presumption that the Governments entering into them are representative of the views of their respective peoples. The position taken up by His Majesty's Government towards the Government of Poland is an

illustration of this principle. (It is not necessary for my purpose to enter into the investigation of the question whether His Majesty's Government had satisfied themselves whether a majority of the Polish people were genuine supporters of the new Government or had accepted it under some sort of constraint.) But if the basic circumstances have undergone no fundamental change, promise or agreement previously made or entered into cannot be ignored or put aside merely by asserting that circumstances have changed. This would be contrary to moral principles. If His Majesty's Government intend to go back upon any of their previous promises relating to India they must state clearly the circumstances under which those promises were made and the change which has taken place in those circumstances, the natural consequence of which should be a departure from the terms of the promises. So long as this is not done the mere assertion that circumstances have changed will only create justifiable suspicion with regard to the motives of the Government in the minds of the community prejudicially affected by repudiation of a previous promise. Moral principles are more powerful than the united strength of Great Britain and India, nay, than even the united strength of the whole world. If, therefore, there has been no fundamental change in the circumstances, the Cabinet Mission instead of using equivocal expressions should plainly declare that the previous Government had to secure the support of certain communities for the war effort, and had dishonestly given assurances to them which the present Government is not prepared to carry into effect. It is not right, therefore, that they should in the same breath endorse the honesty of previous Governments and yet try to back out of the promises made by those Governments by asserting that circumstances have changed, when no such change as would justify a repudiation of those promises has actually taken place.

People at large may be deceived by cliches or catch phrases, but the attitude of those who are given to reflection is not affected by mere words.

The third consideration I would like to place before the Mission is that if a situation is created which should operate to deprive a minority of any part of its just rights the responsibility will lie on the shoulders of His Majesty's Government. They cannot escape blame by saying that they are not directly responsible for the result. They are responsible for bringing into being factors of which the result is the necessary consequence.

The fourth matter to which I desire to draw the attention of the Mission is that if the Mission takes up an attitude of justice and fair dealing, there is every hope that they will succeed in bringing about a communal settlement. I am not prepared to admit that the shape that India has been compelled to adopt under British Rule is necessarily its true shape but equally I am not prepared to deny that whatever unity can be achieved in India by mutual agreement will be beneficial both for India and for the rest of the world.

### British Commonwealth

I am an old admirer of the conception upon which the British Commonwealth of Nations is founded. That conception has proved more beneficial in actual operation than the Covenant of the League of Nations and is in my opinion superior to the Charter of the United Nations Organisation. It is, no doubt, susceptible of improvement, but it would not be in accord with truth and reality (however flattering it might be to our sentiments) to assert that for India to become an equal partner in the British Commonwealth would be to become enslaved to Britain.

Nevertheless, the co-operation of the differen- parts of India in setting up a common constitutional structure and the co-operation of India with the Bril tish Commonwealth must be secured by mutua agreement.

Fifthly, every political principle is not capable of being put into effect with all its implications in every situation. My experience is that most British statesmen are inspired by the desire to force upon India

everything that their experience has shown to have been beneficent in its operation in Great Britain. Conditions in India are very different from conditions in Britain. Freedom has one connotation in Britain and another in India and so has justice. A friend told me on a certain occasion that he asked Mr. Gandhi whether change of religion would be permitted in a free India. Mr. Gandhi replied that there would certainly be freedom of religion but that change of religion involved political considerations and would be subject to suitable regulation by the Government. Surely this cuts right across one's conception of freedom. So, in order to make sure of the point of view of the Congress in this behalf, I directed one of the Secretaries of my community to make inquiries. This Secretary addressed the Secretary of the Congress but received no reply. Two registered reminders also remained unacknowledged. A third reminder was then despatched and a copy was sent to Mr. Gandhi. To this a reply was received by telegram that Mr. Bose (meaning Mr. Subhash Chander Bose, who was then the President of the Congress) regretted that a reply had not so far been sent but that one was being sent now. When the promised reply was received all it said was that attention was invited to a certain resolution of the Congress passed at the Karachi session. The Secretary here wrote back that his object in writing his original letter had been to seek a clarification and interpretation of that very resolution. The reply to this was that Congress alone could interpret its own resolutions. It was pointed out in reply that Congress could be approached for an interpretation only through its office-holders and that no other means was open to an outsider. No reply was received to this letter and so the correspondence ended.

## A Medieval Conception

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

This shows that the conception of freedom entertained by the Congress is similar to that which was current in Medieval Europe and which cannot be accepted by Muslims under any circumstances. A

practical illustration of this is furnished by most of the Hindu States in India, where if a Hindu desires to become a Muslim he cannot do so without obtaining permission from a Magistrate and even then he forfeits his share in the joint family property and is deprived of the custody and guardianship of his minor children. The correspondence with the Congress which has been referred to above merely confirms in this respect what is in operation in most of the Hindu States. In short, expressions like freedom and democracy are not enough. It is necessary to inquire what the connotation of these expressions is among different peoples. Repeated declarations are being made from Moscow that the *reactionary* governments of the Western countries are creating an atmosphere hostile to the U. S S. R. by pretending to give support to democratic principles in Greece, Iran and China. Will the Governments of Britain and America then give up their policies in respect of these countries merely because Moscow chooses to describe them as reactionary? If not, they should be equally vigilant that they are not tricked by the use of the word *democracy* into lending their support to something which in its ultimate effects would run contrary to the principles of justice and fair dealing.

## India : Our Country

My advice to the Muslim Leaguers is that India belongs as much to us as it belongs to the Hindus. We should not seek to weaken our country merely because we are irritated with the policies and activities of some of the extreme sections of the majority community. We have contributed a large share towards building up the greatness of this country. Hindus started serving India only under the British and with the help of the British, but we have served India for eight hundred years. From Peshawar to Manipur and from Himalayas to Madras, are to be found the graves of Muslim patriots who devoted their lives to the service and progress of this country. Muslim monuments are to be found throughout the length and breadth of India.

Shall we abandon all these memorials to our past services and sacrifices in the cause of India and can any one, in spite of these, assert that India belongs to the Hindus only? Surely India belongs more to us than to the Hindus. There exist in India to-day many more reminders of the connection of Muslims with India than of the ancient Aryans. The revenue system of this country, its system of panchayats, its indigenous means of communication are all evidences of Muslim rule in India. How then can it be said that we are foreigners in India? Have we forgotten Spain, because we were forcibly and brutally expelled therefrom some centuries ago? We certainly have not forgotten Spain and Islam will surely claim it once more. In the same way we cannot abandon India. It belongs more to us than to Hindus. Due to our own laziness and neglect we have suffered a temporary loss of it. From the point where our sword became blunted, our speech will start the campaign and by presenting the beautiful and attractive principles of Islam to our Hindu brethren, we shall succeed in making them a part of ourselves. But for this, we must at least keep the door open. We should certainly not agree to anything which spells death and disaster for Islam and Muslims, nor should we do anything which should make it impossible for Islam to continue to flourish throughout India. I am convinced that we can adopt a course which is just and fair. Only, it is necessary that we should not permit our sentiments to run away with us. By basing political policy upon justice and moral principles, Islam has raised politics to a very high level. Standing on this eminence, can we not lay the foundations of peace and goodwill? By emerging from the atmosphere of sentimental slogans, can we not begin to tackle the world of reality so as to secure not only our own true welfare but also the true welfare of others?

I would also urge upon Muslims that they should all stand united at this juncture. They should sink their internal differences and should give their support to the majority and the majority should in turn give its

full support to its leader till either an agreed settlement is arrived at or all hope of such a settlement disappears and it becomes necessary to settle our attitude afresh and to think along new lines. But we should come to no hasty conclusions, lest having arrived so near to success any hasty action on our part should lead us to failure.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

## Threats of Violence

Upon my Hindu brethren and particularly upon Congressmen I would urge that whatever else Mr. Gandhi may or may not have achieved for the Congress, he has laid it under a debt of gratitude by reminding it repeatedly that our decisions should be based upon moral principles. I may differ with him over details but this principle has my full support inas much as my Lord and Master the Holy Prophet Muhammad (on whom be peace and blessings of God) was the first to lay down and to act upon this principle. Congressmen ought to reflect that while they profess to follow the principle of non-violence, some of them are indulging in threats of violence to Muslims in the event of Muslims standing in the way of the Congress achieving its full political objective.

I have only to-day read the statement of a Congress leader in the course of which he says :

"That would be intolerable situation and whether one likes it or not it is bound to lead to an upheaval in the country."

And again,

"But any one who knows the temper of the country, must realise that nothing will be able to stop it and it may take a course which none of us can control."

This leader has made a reference to similar threats held out by Mr. Jinnah. Apart from the question whether Mr. Jinnah did right or wrong in making use of these threats we must remember that Mr. Jinnah is not a believer in non-violence and cannot, therefore,

be accused (in respect of these threats) of professing one thing and doing another. Congress is committed to non-violence and when a Congress leader threatens violence it must mean one of two things. It either means that Congress declared itself non-violent at a stage when it was weak and the declaration of non-violence was meant merely to win the sympathies of the outside world against Britain by representing British repressive measures in the light of tyrannical persecution against a non-violent people, or it was meant to deceive the Government of the country into believing that Congress being non-violent would create no active difficulties in the way of the administration and should be permitted to pursue its activities without let or hindrance. It may be said that the declarations of the Congress leaders quoted by me are meant as warnings that the public would get out of hand and commit acts of violence. If that is so, these declarations belie the claim of the Congress as being the most influential public body in the country. It is true that in each community some few may act in defiance of the advice of its leaders but one cannot believe that so large a section of the public would begin to defy its leaders as to make the situation uncontrollable. This can happen only when those who claim to be leaders are in reality no leaders at all and make a false claim of leadership and influence.

## Congress to Walk Warily

I would advise the Congress to walk very warily on this occasion. They must remember that political conditions are always liable to change and that the seeds some of them are seeking to sow may yield very bitter fruit. They may or may not be convinced but it is a truth nevertheless that He who created this Universe is its Ultimate Ruler and He shall never permit the rich and powerful majority to tyrannise over and persecute the weak minority. Islam shall live and flourish though owing to the defects and shortcomings of Muslims, it may have to pass through a period of difficulties.

It must also be remembered that though, as I have stated above, I myself am of the view that if possible we should by mutual agreement maintain the unity of India, as it has been maintained during several centuries, yet if Muslims should eventually decide to cut asunder from the rest of India and Britain should seek to keep them united to Hindu India against their will, and, as Mr. Jinnah has announced, Muslims should decide to resist this by force they would certainly not be in the position of rebels in the eye of law. For, this would be a new constitutional arrangement and a new form of government. The outgoing authority would have no right to subject Muslims, who were at one time rulers of this country, to the subordination (against their will) of the other community.

At the time of the settlement of a new constitution each part of the country is entitled to make a decision for itself and if one part decides to enforce its rights by force the people thereof cannot be regarded as rebels. On the other hand Hindus were never the rulers of those parts of the country in which Muslims are in a majority ; they cannot claim the support of the law in seeking to impose their rule upon them. On the transfer of political power from Great Britain to India no question of *status quo* arises. If, therefore Muslims, God forbid, feel compelled to have recourse to force for the safeguarding of their rights they would be acting within the law. On the other hand, if Hindus should seek to bring Muslims into political subordination they would be guilty of tyranny and aggression. If the British should seek to keep Muslims within a united India against their will, they would equally be acting tyrannically for Muslims are not so many heads of cattle that the British should be at liberty to deal with them as they please. My advice, therefore, is that this problem should be sought to be resolved by goodwill and not by force or self-devised formulæ. I assure my Hindu brethren that my heart is with them in the sense that I desire that Hindus and Muslims should come to a perfectly

free agreement that they should live together in India as brethren.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

## False Reasoning

I have already stated that I am in support of every effort that may be made to maintain the unity of India and I trust that the separation between Hindus and Muslims would not be permanent but would be a preliminary to their union. I must, however, urge upon my Hindu brethren that false reasoning can never establish a truth and often makes truth itself doubtful.

To my mind, it is no argument against Pakistan that the separation of the Muslim Province from the rest of India would place India's defences in jeopardy. Has the defence of the United States been weakened by the separation of Canada or by the independence of Mexico ? Or, has the defence of Brazil been weakened by the separation of the Argentina ? Even if the Muslim provinces are separated from the rest of India, the population of the latter would still be almost double that of the U. S. S. R. and nearly two and a half times that of the U. S. A. and almost four times that of pre-war Germany, and its area would also be still very large. In one breath we are told that the Muslim provinces will not be able to maintain themselves on a progressive level after separation and in the next breath we are told that India will lose its greatness by their separation. This is the kind of argument which Russia is advancing in support of its policy of absorbing Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria and some of the provinces of Turkey and Iran. It is alleged that Russia with all its strength and resources is unable to defend itself against devastated Germany and defeated Italy or against a mighty Afghanistan and South Iran and that the only manner in which it can secure its defence is to absorb Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria and some of the provinces of Turkey and the northern portion of Iran. Is this the kind of argument by which Hindus seek to create confidence in the minds of Muslims ? I would again

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah
stress the need of each side basing its claims upon moral principles.

## Representative Character of the League

Again, it is alleged that the Muslim League does not correctly represent Muslim opinion in the country inasmuch as a majority of the representatives returned to the Legislatures on the Muslim League ticket are big landholders. This is not in fact true, but even if it were, could it be said that the electors were not at liberty to choose big landholders as their representatives ? This kind of reasoning merely indicates that in the opinion of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru (who has put forward this argument) Muslims are not fit to exercise their franchise. If he is really of that opinion, honesty should have compelled him to announce that as Muslims were unfit to exercise the franchise they should not be consulted with reference to the future constitution of the country. Had he said this, he would at least have been logical, though still in the wrong. But the statement that as Muslim electors have elected a certain number of big landholders as their representatives, the latter cannot be regarded as representing the correct Muslim opinion, is so illogical that one would not expect a leader like Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru to make himself responsible for it. This objection is of the same kind as is sometimes advanced by Muslims against Mr. Gandhi on the ground that he puts up so often at Mr. Birla's residence. Surely Mr. Gandhi is fully justified in staying in Mr. Birla's house, where he is provided with every kind of facilities for conducting his interviews. His staying at Mr. Birla's house is no indication of the fact that he is in the possession or under the influence of capitalists. In the same way if Muslims choose to elect big landholders as their representatives, it does not follow that those people do not represent the Muslim point of view. If people elect the wrong kind of representatives they must take the consequences but nobody has the right to question the representative character of the persons elected. Statements of this kind

merely foster irritation and lead to no beneficial results.

Morever, it is not true in fact that a majority of Muslim League representatives are big landholders. Take the Punjab as an instance. There are in the Punjab Assembly 79 Muslim League members and six Unionist Muslims in coalition with the Congress. Out of these six, three, namely Nawab Sir Khizar Hayat Khan, Nawab Sir Allah Bakhsh Khan and Nawab Sir Muzaffar Ali Khan, that is to say, 50 per cent. of the tota', are big landholders. I do not know the remaining three personally, but it is possible that some one of them may also be a big landholder. As against this, out of the 79 Muslim League members there are only four big landholders namely, the Nawab of Mamdot, Nawab Sir Mohammad Jamal Khan Leghari, Mian Mumtaz Daultana and Mian Allahyar Khan Daultana. Two others, Malik Sir Feroz Khan Noon and Major Ashiq Hussain possibly also be included in this category. This means that six out of 79 Muslim Leaguers, that is to say $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the total, are big landholders as against 50 per cent. of the Muslim Unionists who are in coalition with the Congress.

Does that show that the Muslim League Party is composed mainly of big landholders ? The Congress has held this up as a taunt against the Muslim League for many years. The truth is that if a person is big whether as a landholder or as a merchant or industrialist in an evil sense, he is evil in whatever shape he appears ; but if he is elected as the representative of a constituency, then so long as the law of the land leaves him in possession of his wealth, and the constituency continues to repose confidence in him, his representative capacity is no less than that of any other representative. In the whole of the Punjab there are, according to official figures, only 13 landholders who are assessed to a land revenue demand of more than eight thousand rupees. This means that according to official estimates there are only thirteen landholders whose annual income from land is above sixteen thousand rupees. Even this is not a large income,

The net income of many ordinary traders is in excess of this figure though the whole of it may not always be entered in their income tax returns. A landholder, on the other hand, cannot conceal his land revenue assessment which in turn is a measure of his net income. Out of the landholders that I have mentioned some must be Hindus and Sikhs. But even if it is assumed that all of them are Muslims the figure is quite a small one The total revenue paid by these thirteen is less than one per cent of the total land revenue of the province. This shows that the vast majority of the landholders in the Punjab are small holders. Big holdings of land abound in the U. P., Bihar and Bengal and the majority of big landholders in those provinces are Hindus Most of them support the Congress. This too does not mean that the Congress does not represent the views of the vast majority of the Hindus nor that the representative character of the Congress becomes open to objection on account of the support it derives from big landholders.

### Freedom of change of Religion

One piece of advice which I desire to tender to Congress in particular and to my Hindu brethren in general is that they should change their attitude in respect of the propagation and change of religion. Any interference in religious matters is bound to lead to many evil consequences ; nor can peaceful and orderly conditions be established by casting religion into the mould of politics. They ought to include the freedom of the propagation and change of religion into the fundamental laws of the constitution and thus put an end to that narrow-mindedness in matters of religion which is a blot upon their political policy. No man who values freedom can reconcile himself to any restrictions in these matters. It is possible that this kind of thing may be tolerated so long as the prevalent mentality of the people of the country continues to be slavish but when people become accustomed to freedom, they will not be prepared to tolerate these insulting restrictions. The desired

change is bound to come but those who make themselves responsible for restrictions of this kind, at this stage, will have disgraced themselves for ever in the eyes of coming generations. They can judge how strong is the human desire for freedom, from the fact that all the prejudice that has accumulated around the name of the Emperor Aurangzeb, is generated by the false allegation that he interfered in the matter of religion. It may be alleged that restrictions on the propagation of religion or on change of religion do not amount to interference with religion inasmuch as nobody is thereby compelled to change his faith. This is an entirely wrong notion. Those who opposed Buddha, Krishna, Jesus and Muhammad (on all of whom be peace and blessings of God) also claimed that they did not force anybody to change his religion. They only tried to stop them from propagating the new doctrine and tried to stop people from accepting it, and persecuted those from amongst themselves who were inclined to give their adherence to it. If the same is done here, those responsible for it will have earned the same reward which the enemies of the prophets whom I have named, earned in their times. In brief, we should be careful to avoid creating public agitation by the spread of false or hearsay matters nor should we attempt to influence the Cabinet Mission by similar means. Whether one believes in God or not, it must be remembered that no good can result from the contravention of natural principles The occasion demands that we should concentrate seriously upon the problem of how to win complete freedom for our country, while securing the welfare and happiness of all communities. If this cannot be brought about we shall merely have succeeded in converting India from one kind of prison into another.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

I have in this very sincere statement confined myself to indicating my views very broadly. If need arises, I shall be prepared without considerations of fear or favour, to place more concrete proposals before the Cabinet Mission and those sections of the public who have ears to hear and minds to reflect.

I pray that God may guide the Cabinet Mission as well as Hindus and Muslims to choose the right path. Amen.

MIRZA MAHMUD AHMAD,

*Head of the Ahmadiyya Community, Qadian.*

*April 5, 1946.*

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

# JESUS IN INDIA

BY M. K.

The writer of this article is a non-Ahmady friend who, in the Calcutta Press read notes on a pamphlet by Maulvi J. D. Shams, Imam of the London Mosque, on the death of Jesus Christ and on his tomb having been discovered in Srinagar, Kashmir. He was then given a copy of "Jesus in India" to read and here are his impressions.—*Editor.*

I was not a little interested to read in the newspapers, of the alleged discovery of the tomb of Jesus in Kashmir. Although I had seen references to a theory that, after crucifixion, Jesus had come to India, I did not have the privilege, up to this, of reading any exhaustive treatise on the subject, much as I liked to do it. Now, with the help of my friend Syed Yusuf Ali, who is one of the staunch adherents of the Ahmmadiya Movement, I have had the pleasure of making first-hand acquaintance with this intriguing bit of historic research.

The book he gave me to read—"Jesus in India"—is a brochure of over 150 pages (one hundred and fifty pages) of knit quotations and arguments step by step leading to the author's conclusion that Jesus did not die on the Cross, but had left Jerusalem and after wandering through Persia and Afghanistan reached Kashmir. There is even a map to illustrate the journey. The author is the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, whom Ahmadis believe to be the promised Messiah and Mahdi.

Hazrat Ahmad bases his findings on (1) the testimony of the Bible, (2) the testimonies of the Holy Quran, (3) the testimony of medical books, (4) testimony of historical records, (5) oral traditions, (6) miscellaneous circumstantial evidence, (7) rational argument, (8) fresh revelation from God to Hazrat Ahmad himself.

The testimony drawn from the Gospels is surprisingly the longest and the most numerous. It begins with the prophecy that Jesus will spend three days in

the bowels of the earth as Jonah of old did in the bowels of the whale. Since Jonah came out alive the conclusion is that the prophecy would be untrue (which is an impossibility) if Jesus did not come out alive from the tomb. How did he do it, when he died on the Cross is the problem. The fact is, he did not die on the Cross. A careful reading of the Bible shows that he had spent only a little more than two hours on the Cross, which was not at all enough to kill him. He was only in a death-like swoon. The tombs of Jews in those days were spacious rooms, into which, the Gospels declare, three women "*entered*" to find Jesus. A man could be in such a tomb which has only a stone lid, for three days and still come out alive. That was what happened. The after events described in the Bible, says Hazrat Ahmad, prove it. Jesus' meeting his disciples after the crucifixion; his travelling up to Galilee (a distance of 70 miles); his eating meat and bread; his display of wounds on his body; staying a night with disciples at Emmans; fleeing secretly from Pilates' jurisdiction; emigrating from that place, as was the practice of prophets; and travelling under the shadow of fear—all these are adduced as evidence from the Bible itself that the actions described were those of a man in flesh and blood and not of a spirit, who can show no wounds, who has no need of food, and who need not have been afraid of discovery.

The Holy Quran is then cited to prove this theory. Says the Quran:

> "The Jews neither murdered Jesus, nor did they kill him on the Cross; no, they only suspected that Jesus had died on the Cross; they did not have the arguments which could have convinced and satisfied them that Jesus (on whom be peace) had really died on the Cross".

The third source of proof are books of medicine, In these books there is mention of an ointment with miraculous healing powers. This ointment is known as the "Ointment of Jesus". Mind you, it is not one, two or three books that mention it. Hazrat Ahmad

quotes one thousand medical books that use this name for this ointment, books written by Christians, Jews or Mussalmans, by people separated from each other by thousands of miles and hundreds of years.

The resemblance between Buddhist and Christian doctrines, and the life histories of Christ and Buddha is another factor in favour of the theory that Christ came to India. Buddha prophesied that a second Buddha called *Metteya* would come after five hundred years. Christ who was born five hundred years and arrived in India as the Masiha was hailed by the Buddhists as *Metteya.* It appears that the Hebrew word Masiha is the same as the Pali word Metteya. Having accepted Jesus as a second Buddha, the followers of the Buddhist faith must have, says Hazrat Ahmad, reproduced " the entire picture of the Gospels in their books ; as for example fasting for forty days ; temptation of both ; the birth of both being without father and the moral teaching of both. Just as there was an earthquake when Jesus was put on the Cross, so it is recorded there was an earthquake at the death of the Buddha."

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

All these theories remain only in the realm of possibilities until one can find a reason for the migration of Jesus to India. Hazrat Ahmad has an answer to that problem too. Jesus was in search of the ten lost tribes of Israel, to whom he had to preach the Gospels. By means of a large number of proofs Hazrat Ahmad draws the conclusion that the lost tribes were the Afghans and the Kashmiris.

" It is not surprising therefore that he should have come to India and Kashmir. On the other hand," says Hazrat Ahmad, " it would, indeed, be surprising if without discharging his duties he should have gone up to the Heavens."

The book is published by the Nashr-o-Ishaat (Publicity Department) Sadar Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya, Qadian (India), but no price is given.

## ADVERTISEMENT
## IN
# THE DAILY "AL-FAZL", QADIAN

*MEANS*

## Approach to over 50,000 people daily
## Less Expense—Quick Results
## Country-wide Coverage.

*For advertisement rates apply to :*

**THE ADVERTISEMENT MANAGER**

**"AL-FAZL"**

**QADIAN (India)**


## USEFUL RELIGIOUS LITERATURE

| | Rs. | A. | P. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. THE HOLY QURAN PART I—Translation with explanatory notes, size 20×30/8, pages 121 ... | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. THE TEACHINGS OF ISLAM—By Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised Messiah and Mahdi. Gives a solution of five fundamental problems of human life. An epoch-making book | | | |
| Bound, size 22×20/16, pages 191 ... | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Unbound, size 20×30/16, pages 198 ... | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. THE LODE STAR—By Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised Messiah. Deals with the great reformation brought about by the Holy Prophet among the illiterate, uncultured Arabs which made them the teachers of the world in social matters, polity and ethics. Size 17×27/8, pages 84 ... | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 4. AHMADIYYAT OR THE TRUE ISLAM—By Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, present Head of the Ahmadiyya Community. This book deals in a simple and lucid manner briefly but fully and completely with all the different aspects of the teachings of Islam and Ahmadiyyat. A compendium of the Quranic teachings. | | | |
| Bound, size 20×30/16, pages 433 ... | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Unbound, pages 456 ... | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 5. THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SPLIT—By Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, present Head of the Ahmadiyya Community. A survey of the causes that led to the split which occrured in the Ahmadiyya Community on the debat of Hazrat Maulana Noor-ud-Din, First Successor of the Promised Messiah. Size 20×30/16, pages 376 ... | 1 | 0 | 0 |

*Can be had of :* THE MANAGER

**BOOK DEPOT TALIF-O-ISHA'AT, QADIAN, Punjab (India)**

# A CHALLENGE TO The WHOLE WORLD

WITH

## A PRIZE OF Rs. 1,00,000 FOR PAMPHLET

CONTAINING DETAILS WRITE TO

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

## ABDULLAH ALLAHDIN

Allahdin Buildings, Oxford Street

**SECUNDERABAD Deccan (India)**

**The publishers of Philosophic Abstracts take pleasure in announcing for Summer 1941 publication**

# THE DICTIONARY OF PHILOSOPHY

Although embraced in one volume, the dictionary covers metaphysics ethics, epistemology, logic, philosophy of religion, æsthetics, philosophy of law, philosophy of education, social philosophy and philosophical psychology Special emphasis has been placed on the definition of basic concepts and terms germane to the contemporary schools of philosophy, logical positivism, dialectical materialism, mathematical logic, neo-scholaticism, philosophy of science, Chinese, Jewish and Indian philosophy.

The DICTIONARY OF PHILOSOPHY is edited by Dagobert D. Runes with the collaboration of Alonzo Church, Rudolf Carnap, G. Watts Cunningnam, Edgar Sheffield Brightman, Irwin Edman, Rudolf Allers, A. C. Ewing, Ralph Tyler Flewelling, Jorgen Jorgensen, Ledger Wood, William Marias Malisoff, Carl G. Hampel, B. A. G. Fuller. A. Cornelius Benjamin, Hunter Guthrie. Wilbur Long. V. J. Mc Gill. A. C. Pegis, Glenn Benjamin, Jeseph Rather, Wendell T. Bush, Dorion Cairns, James K. Feibleman, Paul A. Schillp. paul Weiss and a number of other scholar.

*Applications for further literature, as well as other communications should be addressed to :*

**PHILOSOPHIC ABSTRACTS**

**15 EAST 40th STREET** **NEW YORK CITY**